

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

Please amend Figure 1 to include a server 160 and a queue 106. A replacement Figure incorporating these changes is submitted herewith and is designated as such by an appropriate identifier in the top margin thereof.

Please amend Figure 3 to include WEB KEY option on a toolbar that includes corresponding reference numeral 302. Please also amend Figure 3 to include a reference numeral 322 corresponding with the SUBMIT option. A replacement Figure incorporating these changes is submitted herewith and is designated as such by an appropriate identifier in the top margin thereof.

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the instant application is respectfully requested. The present submission is provided in conjunction with a Declaration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.131, a copy of which is enclosed. This amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action of September 10, 2004, in which claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e), as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,493,702 to Adar. The Examiner has further objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) for allegedly failing to show structural details essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention. Additionally, the Examiner has objected to the specification regarding various informalities. Finally, the Examiner has rejected claims 2 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being hybrid claims, namely, apparatus depending from a method. New claims 13 and 14 have been added, leaving claims 1-14 for examination.

Objections to the Drawings

The drawings have been objected to for failing to show "...database replicas temporarily stored in a queue awaiting replication (not shown)" as described in the specification on page 6, lines 19-20. Figure 1 has been amended to include a queue storing database replicas awaiting replication by applications running on server 104.

Further, the Examiner indicates that on page 6, lines 25-26, and page 7, lines 16-17, these processes are listed as 'not shown'. Figure 1 has been further amended to include a server 160 in communication with server 140 as described in the specification on page 6, lines 16-17. Additionally, Figure 3 has been amended to include a reference 302 to the toolbar depicted on main menu screen 300 that further references the WEB KEY launch option as described in the specification on page 7, lines 16-17. Additionally, Figure 3 has been amended to include a reference numeral 322 corresponding to the SUBMIT option on main menu screen 300 as described on page 7, lines 16-17.

No new matter has been entered with respect to the amendments to Figures 1 and 3. As such, the amendments to Figures 1 and 3 are believed to address and overcome

each of the Examiner's drawing objections. The Applicants submit that the drawings are in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) and respectfully request withdrawal of the objections.

Objections to the Specification:

The Examiner has objected to the specification recited on page 5, line 24, which states "...the Web key tool", and requests it be changed to "...the web key tool". The Applicants have amended the specification accordingly.

The Examiner has objected to the specification recited on page 6, line 12, which states "...shares information with client systems...", as being unclear. The Applicants have amended the specification to recite that "one or more of client systems 114, 116, and 130" may receive information shared by server 104, as described on page 6, line 12 of the specification. It is believed that this amendment clarifies which client systems receive information overcoming the outstanding objection. Reconsideration of the objection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has further objected to the specification recited on page 8, line 6, which references a process as "...(not shown) at step 222". The Examiner asserts that this process is shown in FIG. 2. The Applicants have amended the specification and Figure 3 to include a reference number 322 corresponding to the submit option appearing on main menu screen 300 of FIG. 3. As indicated by the Examiner, this process is, in fact, shown in the flow diagram of FIG. 2. Accordingly, the Applicants submit that this amendment overcomes the outstanding objection and requests reconsideration.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph:

Claims 2 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being hybrid claims, namely, apparatus depending from a method. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 2 and 6. Claims 2 and 6 as recited by the Applicants do not recite an apparatus depending from a method as suggested by the Examiner. Rather claims 2 and 6 are method claims that further clarify

the nature of the claim limitation “information relating to a web site” as recited in claims 1 and 5, respectively. MPEP 903.08(e) provides an example of a hybrid claim, namely, a product defined merely in terms of the process for producing it. See also MPEP 705.01(e). As indicated above, the limitations recited in claims 2 and 6 simply further define a claim limitation in claims 1 and 5 from which claims 2 and 6 depend. Accordingly, the Applicants submit that claims 2 and 6 properly conform to 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph and respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding rejections.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e):

Claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e), as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,493,702 to Adar. The Applicants swear behind the Adar reference and submit herewith a Declaration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.131 in support. The Declaration includes Exhibits A and B, with dates redacted, that support the Applicants’ conception and reduction to practice of the features of the invention as recited in claims 1-14, which antedate May 5, 1999, the date of the Adar reference. Accordingly, the Applicants submit that the instant application is patentable over the Adar reference rendering moot the outstanding rejections of claims 1-12.

The Applicants have added new claims 13 and 14 for consideration in the instant application. For at least the reasons presented above, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that the foregoing amendments and remarks fully comply with the Office Action and that the claims herein should now be allowable to Applicants. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance is requested. It is submitted that the foregoing amendments and remarks should render the case in condition for allowance.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130 maintained by Applicants' attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,
JUDY J. KOGUT-O'CONNELL ET AL.
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
Applicants' Attorneys

By: Marisa J. Dubuc
Marisa J. Dubuc
Registration No. 46,673
Customer No. 29371

Date: March 10, 2005
Address: 55 Griffin Road South, Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone: (860) 286-2929
Fax: (860) 286-0115